

IV. STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES

A. Procedures to Review and Monitor Field Activities, Construction, and Other Undertakings to Ensure Compliance with CRMP

Coordination for all projects that will involve ground-disturbing activities and that may affect historic properties is the ultimate responsibility of the Installation Commander. This responsibility may, however, be assumed by the Installation Commander's Representative or the appointed HPC who serves as the point-of-contact for the installation cultural resources. The individual who fulfills this coordination role will be referred to as the CRPOC in the following discussion. *The use of the term "historic property" in the following sections means all cultural resources listed on the NRHP as well as cultural resources eligible for or potentially eligible (of unknown eligibility) for inclusion in the NRHP.* The CRPOC will serve as the central point of review for all proposed undertakings and will serve as the central point of contact for the subcontractor. The CRPOC will review the proposed project against the cultural resources data base to determine whether the APE has been surveyed and whether historic properties are present within the project area. In the event that the area has not been surveyed and the APE has not been previously disturbed, the CRPOC will consult with the SHPO and will determine whether further 106 review is required. The installation is required to take into consideration the views of the SHPO.

It should be the responsibility of the manager(s) of installation activities and security to coordinate with the CRPOC.

- These managers should submit to the CRPOC for review all work orders or design plans that have the potential to affect either historic properties or previously undisturbed and unsurveyed land.
- The managers should not proceed with the project until the CRPOC provides clearance for such action.

Coordination of any undertaking with the SHPO and/or the ACHP is the responsibility of the CRPOC.

- When a site visit is made to determine what work is required, it may be beneficial to include the SHPO in the visit.
- Upon receipt of SHPO and/or ACHP comments, the CRPOC takes comments into consideration and forwards the applicable comments to the appropriate managers.
- The CRPOC works with the respective managers to provide correspondence regarding changes and/or modifications resulting from comments of the review agencies.
- Copies of all correspondence concerning coordination efforts should be retained in the project file.

Monitoring of any activity that may directly or indirectly impact a historic property involves two phases.

- First, the CRPOC should be responsible for monitoring the project. To alleviate the monitoring responsibility, however, an individual who is involved with the undertaking may be appointed by the CRPOC to serve as a monitor designee. Thus, the monitoring responsibility will not fall upon a single individual who may not always be available.
 - * The CRPOC, the monitor, and a field supervisor of the third-party subcontractor visit the project area, evaluate the site context in relation to planned activities, and decide how the historic property may be best protected (marked, fenced, sterile overburden, or mitigation through excavation). Advice from outside archeologists may be sought.
 - * The CRPOC should place a brief descriptive summary of the protection plan within the project file.

- Second, the CRPOC and the monitor decide on a schedule of regular site visits in order to supervise properly the protection of the historic property.
 - * Any damage to the historic property as a result of the undertaking should be documented through photographs and a written assessment of the damage. The facility may seek advice from outside archeologists to accomplish this task.
 - * Steps taken to ensure that no further damage occurs should also be documented.

B. Step by Step Examples of Section 106 Review

Federal actions listed in the installation Natural Resources Management Plan—and in other sources—that may constitute an adverse effect to archeological historic properties include such projects as facility construction, utilities and pipeline construction, borrow pit excavations, hazardous waste remediation, soil erosion control, tree plantation development, right-of-way easements, and excessing lands to nonfederal parties. Projects affecting architectural historic properties would include such actions as maintenance/repair and renovation/rehabilitation. These are the types of projects with which the CRPOC must be most concerned regarding the management of cultural resources. The previous chapter reviewed the general procedures for review. The following sections present actual examples of actions and the procedures to be followed for such activities—such as general actions, forest management, agricultural leases, and other actions—that may apply currently or in the future. These procedures will serve to determine whether there is no effect, no adverse effect, or an adverse effect on historic properties (eligible for or listed on the NRHP and cultural resources of unknown/potential eligibility). For actions not specifically addressed in these examples, Section 106 review should be followed.

1. General Actions

Step 1: CRPOC and Project Manager will determine impact of project on historic properties. Assessment of impact may require professional assistance from historic preservation specialists.

- If the area has been surveyed and no historic properties are present, proceed with the project.
- If sufficient information is not available for decision-making, consult with the SHPO to determine if survey is required.
- If historic properties are present, CRPOC and Project Manager will determine if historic properties can be avoided and protected from direct or indirect impacts.
 - * If historic properties are present within the APE and those properties can not be avoided, the CRPOC will seek consultation with the SHPO to develop a mitigative treatment.
 - * If cultural resources of potential NRHP eligibility exist within the project area, the CRPOC can develop a testing program to complete the NRHP eligibility evaluation of those resources and will report the findings to the SHPO.
 - * If historic properties exist within the APE and the CRPOC, Project Manager, and Design Engineers can develop a plan to facilitate avoidance of and protection for those resources, the project may proceed following concurrence by the SHPO.

Step 2: CRPOC will inform contracting officer of specifications that must be included within subcontracts or work orders to maintenance staff.

Step 3: Implement protection measures.

These measures may include:

- marking and avoidance of site boundaries,
- fencing and avoidance of site, or
- sealing site with sterile fill dirt.

Step 4: Familiarize any subcontractor with historic property locations and protection measures.

Step 5: The CRPOC and/or Project Manager will monitor contracted activities to ensure the protection of historic properties.

2. Forest Management

Step 1: Timber Manager will determine if the operation is ground-disturbing and whether the area has been surveyed.

- If ongoing timber management programs do not recontour land nor disturb the ground surface and are conducted under dry or frozen ground conditions, the logging may proceed in areas not surveyed.
- If the logging process will cause ground disturbance within an area that is unsurveyed and is on undisturbed ground, the CRPOC will require a survey of the APE. If no historic properties are present, the harvesting may proceed.
- If the area has been surveyed and historic properties are present, the CRPOC will determine locations of historic properties. If such resources are present, then proceed to Step 2.

Step 2: CRPOC will determine treatment options applicable to each site.

- Direct impacts to the properties—as well as to a 50-foot buffer extending out from marked site edges—from tree-planting areas or harvesting skid trails and loading and logistical staging areas will be avoided.
- In the event that emergency situations—such as uncontrolled wildfire or insect infestation—should arise, the appropriate actions to control the emergency should be taken, with the impact to historic properties affected by the actions assessed after the fact.

Step 3: The CRPOC and the Timber Manager will mark locations of historic properties.

- Boundaries will be conspicuously marked with fluorescent paint and/or fluorescent flagging tape.

Step 4: Inform contracting officer of special requirements related to historic properties.

Step 5: Familiarize subcontractor with locations of historic properties and their treatment options.

Step 6: The CRPOC and/or the Timber Manager for the installation will monitor any such tree removal in order to ensure the protection of the historic properties.

3. Agricultural Leases

Step 1: The CRPOC will be apprised as to whether or not the land use will change, resulting in ground-disturbing actions (e.g., from hay production or grazing land to crop land), and will determine whether the area has been surveyed.

Step 2: The CRPOC will determine treatment options applicable to each historic property.

- Degradation of historic properties through plowing, stock pond construction, fencing, or cattle guard construction will be avoided.
- Agricultural use of the historic property will be permitted, with the proviso that such use will be consistent with the previous utilization of the property and will not involve significant disturbance of surface sediments. The use of the property as pasture is an example of permitted use. An alteration in the land use of the property, e.g., from untilled grazing land to tilled crop land, is an action that will require Section 106 review.

4. Unexpected Cultural Resources Discoveries Made During Implementation of an Undertaking

The accidental discoveries of cultural resources during an undertaking can include but are not limited to:

- undiscovered/undocumented structural and engineering features; and
- undiscovered/undocumented archeological resources such as foundation remains, artifacts, or other evidence of human occupation.

When such cultural resources are discovered, the facility will proceed with the treatment of such resources in accordance with the following Discovery Plan.

Step 1: Work shall cease in the area of the discovery.

- The resource is to be treated as eligible and avoided until an eligibility determination is made. The CRPOC will continue to make reasonable efforts to avoid or minimize harm to the resource until NHPA and ARPA requirements are met.
- If Native American remains or associated funerary objects are involved, NAGPRA will apply. Notification to the appropriate federally recognized Indian Tribe will follow specific requirements set forth in NAGPRA; the SHPO and the ACHP have no statutory role in such an action. In cases of suspected Native American burials or associated funerary objects, see the following section for procedures regarding the recovery of human remains and the requisite NAGPRA regulations. NAGPRA, however, is not part of the Section 106 process.

Step 2: In compliance with NHPA and ARPA requirements, within 24 hours of the discovery, the consultant/subcontractor shall notify the CRPOC who, in turn, will notify, if necessary, the SHPO.

- The CRPOC may elect to involve the ACHP.
 - * When the Army elects to directly involve the ACHP in an emergency discovery coordination, the SHPO and the ACHP shall be notified at the earliest possible time, and comments shall be requested. The ACHP shall provide interim comments to the Army within 48 hours of the request and final comments to the Army within 30 days of the request pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800.11(c)(2).
- or*
- The CRPOC may contact the SHPO or other interested parties of the discovery within 72 hours.
 - * The Army will develop and implement actions that take into account the effects of the undertaking on the property to the extent feasible and the comments from the SHPO pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800.11(c).

Step 3: In the unlikely event that no consensus can be reached on the significance of a discovered resource, the Secretary's Keeper of the National Register will be requested to provide a determination.

5. Procedures for the Recovery of Human Remains

If human remains are encountered during construction, maintenance, or archeological test excavations, NAGPRA must be considered.

Step 1: Project Manager, the construction supervisor, or project archeologist will:

- cease activities in the immediate area of discovery,
- make an effort to protect the resources, and
- provide notification to the CRPOC who will inform the security office.

If the remains are determined to be of aboriginal origin, specific NAGPRA regulations must be followed pursuant to 43 CFR Part 10.4. NAGPRA requires that, upon an unexpected discovery of Native American human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony, further construction or archeological activities in the area of discovery cease for 30 days after the appropriate federally recognized tribes and/or lineal descendants have been officially notified.

Step 2: Removal of Native American human remains may proceed when:

- the consent of the appropriate federally recognized tribal group is obtained,
- ownership and right-of-control of such items is not in dispute, and
- proof of consultation and notification is documented.

Step 3: The CRPOC will be responsible for site security pending resumption of the testing operations or resolution of site mitigation.

The facility should establish procedures and agreements with the federally recognized Native American tribe(s) for the treatment of unmarked burials in the event of an unexpected discovery. Anticipating such a possibility, a PA or an MOU may be established with the appropriate tribe(s) that may expedite the review process and override the mandated 30-day work stoppage. NAGPRA compliance does not, however, include Section 106 compliance.

6. Unintentional Partial Damage to an Eligible Archeological Site or Site of Unknown Eligibility

Step 1: CRPOC will be notified of damage.

Step 2: CRPOC will document damage both photographically and in a written summary report.

Step 3: CRPOC, in consultation with a qualified prehistoric or historic archeologist (dependent upon type of site), will determine if limited excavations should be conducted to collect available data or if site context may be stabilized.

- If disturbance was the result of construction plans that did not account for a known site and such construction will further damage the site, CRPOC will ensure that no further damage occurs until consultation with the SHPO concerning appropriate mitigation actions is finalized.
- If disturbance is limited and no further disturbance is anticipated, stabilization of the site context should be accomplished with sterile (artifact free) fill dirt and appropriate erosion control measures.

Step 4: CRPOC and a qualified archeologist will develop a plan for limited data recovery and/or stabilization.

Step 5: CRPOC submits the plan to the SHPO for review and concurrence.

- If SHPO does not concur, follow Section 106 compliance procedures. If there is disagreement between the SHPO and the facility, the facility needs to follow the procedures set out in 36 CFR 800 (either submit to the ACHP or go to the Secretary's Keeper of the NRHP) for comment. If the SHPO concurs with a mitigation plan, that mitigation will likely have to be completed before the project will be able to proceed.
- If SHPO concurs, the project may proceed.

Step 6: CRPOC will inform contracting officer of appropriate specifications that must be included within the contract or subcontract.

Step 7: Project Manager will familiarize subcontractor with significant features of historic property and with protection measures.

Step 8: CRPOC and/or Project Manager will monitor contracted activities to ensure the integrity of the historic property.

Step 9: CRPOC will submit photographs of the property taken upon completion of the project to the SHPO to document compliance.

Step 10: CRPOC shall retain documentation of limited data recovery and/or stabilization, including work write-ups and photographs, as part of the permanent project records.

7. New Construction: Building/Facility and Utility

New construction of a building/facility and utilities is potentially damaging to cultural resources within or adjacent to the construction zone. Typically, construction includes the removal of soils from the site and provision for parking facilities and access roads that could destroy the integrity of archeological deposits in near-surface soils. In the case of architectural historic properties, which include buildings, structures, and objects, such construction may involve visual impacts to the surrounding historic properties or cultural landscapes.

Step 1: CRPOC and Project Manager will determine whether the area has been surveyed and the impact of the project on historic properties. Assessment of impact may require professional assistance from historic preservation specialists.

- If no historic properties are present, proceed with the project.
- If historic properties are present, CRPOC and Project Manager will determine if properties may be avoided and protected from direct or indirect impacts.
 - * If properties can not be avoided or protected, go to Section 106 compliance procedures.
 - * If properties can be avoided or protected, CRPOC, Project Manager, and Design Engineers will develop a plan to facilitate avoidance and protection.

Step 2: CRPOC will submit a letter of notification concerning the above plan to the SHPO as a check within the system.

This letter will outline:

- the proposed activity,
- the area of impact,

- the known historic properties within the project area, and
- the efforts implemented to avoid or protect the historic properties.

Step 3: CRPOC will inform contracting officer of specifications that must be included within contract.

Step 4: Implement protection measures.

For archeological historic properties these measures may include:

- avoidance of historic properties through project design;
- protection of the site during construction;
- monitoring the status of the site throughout the construction process; or
- mitigation of the loss of the site through data recovery.

For architectural historic properties, options include:

- design of the new construction so that it is compatible with the surrounding buildings; or
- establishment of visual screens between the new entity and adjacent historic properties.

Step 5: Familiarize subcontractor with historic property locations and protection measures.

Step 6: CRPOC and/or the Project Manager will monitor contracted activities to ensure the protection of the historic properties.

8. Hazardous Waste/Materials Assessment

Hazardous waste assessment usually includes core borings or the placement of small-diameter monitor wells within the locality of suspected contamination and, thus, affects belowground resources. These activities are potentially damaging to a historic property context. Care should be taken to avoid damage to archeological historic properties or change to immediate grounds of architectural historic properties which may include lawns, trees, sidewalks, and appropriate street furniture such as lamp posts.

Step 1: CRPOC will determine whether the area has been surveyed and treatment options applicable to each historic property.

- Historic property will be totally avoided, if possible.
- If property can not be avoided, activities should be limited to coring only during dry soil conditions.

Step 2: CRPOC and Hazardous Waste Manager will mark locations of historic properties.

- Boundaries of known archeological historic properties should be marked with conspicuous markers such as fluorescent paint and/or fluorescent flagging tape.

Step 3: Inform contracting officer of special requirements related to historic properties.

Step 4: Familiarize subcontractor with locations of historic properties and treatment options.

Step 5: CRPOC and/or the Hazardous Waste Manager will monitor contracted activities to ensure the protection of the historic properties.

9. Hazardous Waste/Materials Remediation

Hazardous waste remediation may vary in its impact on a given locality. However, whether the operation is designed to recycle and filter the ground water or remove the soil matrix, such remediation typically affects only resources below ground. Any activities involving the remediation process should take cultural resources into consideration. Although the major areas of concern are those activities that might affect basements or unrecorded archeological sites, the manager in charge of hazardous waste management should, if possible, avoid known historic properties.

Step 1: CRPOC will determine whether the area has been surveyed and treatment options applicable to any historic property.

- The historic property will be totally avoided, if possible.
- If the property can not be avoided, personnel conducting remediation work involving environmental hazards will exercise care when working in the area of historic property and/or areas of archeological sensitivity.
- Professional archeological advice will be made available in the event of an archeological discovery.
- OSHA standards will be followed for archeological survey personnel that must be involved in inventory and/or assessment of cultural resources in contaminated areas.

Step 2: CRPOC and Hazardous Waste Manager will mark locations of historic properties.

- Boundaries of known archeological sites should be conspicuously marked with fluorescent paint and/or fluorescent flagging tape.

Step 3: Inform contracting officer of special requirements related to historic properties.

Step 4: Familiarize subcontractor with locations of historic properties and treatment options.

Step 5: CRPOC and/or the Hazardous Waste Manager will monitor contracted activities to ensure the protection of historic properties.

10. Borrow Pit Excavation

New borrow pit excavations and horizontal expansions of existing pits are particularly damaging to archeological resources since they are designed to remove the soil in which archeological deposits are found. The use of existing borrow pits, *if not expanded horizontally*, will have no additional impact on historic properties and will require no action in regard to cultural resources coordination.

Step 1: CRPOC will determine whether the area has been surveyed and treatment options applicable for each historic property.

- If historic properties can not be avoided, go to Section 106 compliance procedures.
- If historic properties may be avoided and protected from direct or indirect impacts, take the following actions.

Step 2: CRPOC will mark locations of historic properties.

- Boundaries of known archeological sites should be conspicuously marked with fluorescent paint and/or fluorescent flagging tape prior to borrow pit excavation, so that they will indeed be avoided.

Step 3: Inform contracting officer of special requirements related to historic properties.

Step 4: Familiarize subcontractor with locations of historic properties and treatment options.

Step 5: The CRPOC will monitor contracted activities to ensure the protection of historic properties.

11. Maintenance and Repair of Architectural Historic Properties Not Covered under the PA

Maintenance and repair may damage the character and integrity of architectural historic properties if proper procedures are not followed. Therefore, in order not to alter the character or integrity of the property, the following procedures should be followed:

- distinctive features or characteristics of the building, structure, or object should not be removed;
- the same or similar materials must be used for repair;
- if replacement is necessary, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and—where possible—materials;
- replacement of features will be documented through records and photographs; and
- chemical or physical treatments should not be allowed to damage the historic materials.

Step 1: Project manager will submit project plan to CRPOC for review.

Step 2: CRPOC will check if the area/facility has been inventoried.

- If NO, go to Section 106 compliance procedures.
- If YES, determine locations and nature of historic properties.

Step 3: CRPOC will determine if project can be accomplished in accordance with the maintenance and repair plan and thereby have no effect.

- If NO, go to Section 106 compliance procedures.
- If YES, the project may proceed.

Step 4: CRPOC and Project Manager will ensure that maintenance personnel are familiar with maintenance and repair procedures or will inform contracting officer of special requirements for contracts related to maintenance and repair of historic properties.

Step 5: Project Manager will familiarize subcontractor with maintenance and repair procedures.

Step 6: CRPOC and/or the Project Manager will monitor maintenance or repair activities to ensure the protection of the historic properties.

12. Renovation/Rehabilitation of Architectural Historic Properties Not Covered under the PA

Step 1: CRPOC and Project Manager in consultation with qualified Historic Architect will determine impact of project on historic properties.

- If no historic properties are present, proceed with the project.
- If historic properties are present, CRPOC and Project Manager will determine if properties may be treated in such a manner as to avoid an adverse effect.
 - * If NO, go to Section 106 compliance procedures.

- * If YES, CRPOC, Project Manager, and Design Engineers will develop a plan to facilitate avoidance and protection.

Step 2: CRPOC will submit a letter of notification concerning the above plan to the SHPO as a check within the system.

This letter will outline:

- the proposed activity,
- the area of impact,
- the known historic properties within the project area, and
- the efforts implemented to avoid or protect the historic properties.

Step 3: CRPOC will inform contracting officer of specifications that must be included within contract.

Step 4: Implement protection measures.

Step 5: Familiarize subcontractor with significant features of historic property and protection measures.

Step 6: CRPOC and/or the Project Manager will monitor contracted activities to ensure the protection of the historic properties.

In the case of renovation/rehabilitation of historic properties where the installation agrees to conduct all work in accordance with the recommended approaches in the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*, the following procedures should be followed:

Step 1: CRPOC, Project Manager, and a qualified Historic Architect will develop a plan for each rehabilitation project, including architectural specifications and photographs.

Step 2: The plan is submitted for review and concurrence of the SHPO.

- If SHPO does not concur, go to Section 106 compliance procedures.
- If SHPO concurs, the project may proceed.

Step 3: CRPOC will inform contracting officer of specifications that must be included within contract.

Step 4: Familiarize subcontractor with significant features of historic property and protection measures.

Step 5: CRPOC and/or the Project Manager will monitor contracted activities to ensure the protection of the historic properties.

Step 6: CRPOC will submit to the SHPO photographs of the property taken upon completion of the rehabilitation.

Step 7: CRPOC shall retain documentation of rehabilitation, including work write-ups and photographs, as part of the permanent project records.

13. Unintentional Partial Damage to Architectural Historic Properties Not Covered under the PA

Step 1: CRPOC will be notified of damage.

Step 2: CRPOC will document damage both photographically and in a written summary report.

Step 3: CRPOC, in consultation with a qualified Historic Architect, will determine whether repair or reconstruction can be accomplished in accordance with the Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation and thereby have no effect.

- If an adverse effect is projected, go to Section 106 compliance procedures.
- If there is no effect or no adverse effect, the project may proceed.

Step 4: Project Manager and a qualified Historic Architect, under the direction of the CRPOC, will develop a plan for repair or rehabilitation, including architectural specifications and photographs.

Step 5: CRPOC submits the plan for review and concurrence of the SHPO that the plan meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

- If SHPO does not concur, go to Section 106 compliance procedures.
- If SHPO concurs, the project may proceed.

Step 6: CRPOC will inform contracting officer of appropriate specifications that must be included within contract.

Step 7: Project Manager will familiarize subcontractor with significant features of historic property and protection measures.

Step 8: Project Manager and/or CRPOC will monitor contracted activities to ensure the integrity of the historic property.

Step 9: CRPOC will submit photographs of the property taken upon completion of the rehabilitation to the SHPO to document compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings.

Step 10: CRPOC shall retain documentation of rehabilitation, including work write-ups and photographs, as part of the permanent project records.



V. REFERENCES CITED

Adair, M.J.

- 1975 *A Cultural Resource Survey of a Nitroguanidine Facility at Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant*. Museum of Anthropology, University of Kansas, Lawrence. Submitted to Hercules, Inc.

- 1988 *Prehistoric Agriculture in the Central Plains*. University of Kansas Publications in Anthropology No. 16. University of Kansas Press, Lawrence.

Allen, L.F.

- 1852 *Rural Architecture; Being a Complete Description of Farm Houses, Cottages, and Out Buildings Comprising Wood Houses, Workshops, Tools Houses, Carriage and Wagon Houses, Stables, Smoke and Ash Houses, Ice Houses, Apiary or Bee House, Poultry Houses, Rabbitry, Dovecote, Piggery, Barns and Sheds for Cattle, Together with Lawns, Pleasure Grounds and Parks; the Flower, Fruit, and Vegetable Gardens*. C.M. Saxton Agricultural Book Publishers, New York.

Andreas, A.T.

- 1883 *History of the State of Kansas; Containing: A Full Account of its Growth From an Uninhabited Territory to a Wealthy and Important State; of its Early Settlements; its Rapid Increase in Population, and the Marvelous Development of its Great Natural Resources; Also, a Supplementary History and Description of its Cities, Towns, and Villages, Their Advantages, Industries, Manufactures and Commerce; to Which are Added Biographical Sketches and Portraits of Prominent Men and Early Settlers*. Donnelly and Sons, Chicago.

Arnold, A.E.

- 1931 *A History of Kansas*. Published by the State of Kansas, Topeka.

Baker, T.L.

- 1989 Irrigating with Windmills on the Great Plains. *Great Plains Quarterly* 9(4):216-230.

Baughman, R.W.

- 1961 *Kansas in Maps*. Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.

Beck, W.A., and Y.D. Haase

- 1989 *Historical Atlas of the American West*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.

Blair, E.

- 1915 *History of Johnson County, Kansas*. Standard Publishing Company, Lawrence.

Blakeslee, D.J., and A.H. Rohn

- 1986 *Man and Environment in Northeastern Kansas: The Hillsdale Lake Project, vols. 1-6*. Draft. Submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Kansas City District.

Brown, K.L.

- 1984 *Pomona: A Plains Village Variant in Eastern Kansas and Western Missouri*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Kansas, Lawrence.
- 1987 Section VIII, The Study Units. In *Kansas Prehistoric Archaeological Preservation Plan*, edited by L. Brown and A.H. Simmons, pp. VIII-1 - VIII-11. Office of Archaeological Research, Museum of Anthropology and Center for Public Affairs, University of Kansas, Lawrence.

Brown, K.L., and M.E. Brown

1986 The Archaic, Ceramic, and Historic Periods. In *Culture History, Kansas Archaeological Preservation Plan*, Vol. II, edited by K.L. Brown and A.H. Simmons. Office of Archaeological Research, Museum of Anthropology and Center for Public Affairs, University of Kansas, Lawrence.

1987 Section IX; The Paleo-Indian Period. In *Kansas Prehistoric Archaeological Preservation Plan*, edited by K.L. Brown and A.H. Simmons, pp. 9.1-9.24. Office of Archaeological Research, Museum of Anthropology and Center for Public Affairs, University of Kansas, Lawrence.

Brown, K.L., and B. Logan

1987 The Distribution of Paleoindian Sites in Kansas. In *Quaternary Environments of Kansas*, edited by W.C. Johnson, pp. 189-195. Kansas Geological Survey Guidebook No. 5. University of Kansas Press, Lawrence.

Brown, K.L., and A.L. Simmons

1984 *Kansas Preservation Plan, Phase I*. Museum of Anthropology, University of Kansas, Lawrence. Submitted to the Historic Preservation Department, Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.

Bryan, A.L.

1965 *Paleo-Indian Prehistory*. Occasional Papers of the Idaho Museum of Natural History No. 16. Pocatello, Idaho.

Callahan, E.

1979 The Basics of Biface Knapping in the Eastern Fluted Point Tradition: A Manual for Flintknappers and Lithic Analysts. *Archaeology of Eastern North America* 7(1):1-180.

Culp, C.

1987 *De Soto*. Master's thesis on file, Olathe Public Library, Olathe, Kansas.

Feagins, J.D.

1989 *A Cultural Resource Survey of a Proposed Access Road Location Within the Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant, Johnson County, Kansas*. Cultural Resource Report No. 40. Kansas City Museum, Kansas City, Missouri.

1991 *Testing Archaeological Sites 14JO51 and 14JO429 Within the Proposed Sunflower Quarry Expansion Area, Johnson County, Kansas*. Cultural Resource Report No. 6. Saint Joseph Museum, Saint Joseph, Missouri.

Frison, G.

1976 *Prehistoric Hunters of the High Plains*. Academic Press, New York.

1991 *Prehistoric Hunters of the High Plains*. Second Edition. Academic Press, New York.

George A. Ogle & Company

1902 *Standard Atlas of Johnson County, Kansas; Including a Plat Book of the Villages, Cities, and Townships of the County, Map of the United States and World, Patrons Directory, Reference Business Directory and Departments devoted to General Information*. George A. Ogle & Company, Publishers, Chicago.

- 1922 *Standard Atlas of Johnson County, Kansas; Including a Plat Book of the Villages, Cities, and Townships of the County, Map of the United States and World, Patrons Directory, Reference Business Directory and Departments devoted to General Information.* George A. Ogle & Company, Publishers, Chicago.
- Gramly, R.M.
- 1992 *Guide to the Paleo-Indian Artifacts of North America.* Second Revised Edition. Persimmon Press Monographs in Archaeology. Kenmore, New York.
- 1993 *The Richey Clovis Cache: Earliest Americans Along the Columbia River.* Persimmon Press Monographs in Archaeology. Kenmore, New York.
- Gregg, O.H.
- 1874 *History of Johnson County, Kansas.* In *Atlas Map of Johnson County, Kansas, Compiled From Actual Personal Surveys and Records; With Over One Hundred Representative Views of Residences and Public Buildings, Together With Personal Sketches of Old Settlers of the County, and Those Contributing Views*, by E.F. Heisler and D.M. Smith, pp. 1-87. E.F. Heisler & Company, Publishers, Wyandotte.
- Gressley, G., and H. Scolofsky
- 1970 *The Great Plains Experience; the Great Depression.* Master's thesis on file, National Endowment for the Humanities Library.
- Grosser, R.D.
- 1977 *Late Archaic Subsistence Patterns From the Central Great Plains; a Systematic Model.* Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Kansas, Lawrence.
- Gruhn, R., and A.L. Bryan
- 1977 *Los Tapiales: A Paleoindian Site in the Guatemalan Highlands.* *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 121(3):235-273. Philadelphia.
- Hale, E.E.
- 1854 *Kanzas and Nebraska: the History, Geographical and Physical Characteristics, and Political Position of Those Territories; an Account of the Emigrant Aid Companies, and Directions to Emigrants.* Phillips, Sampson and Company, Boston.
- Heisler, E.F., and D.M. Smith
- 1874 *Atlas Map of Johnson County, Kansas, Compiled From Actual Personal Surveys and Records; With Over One Hundred Representative Views of Residences and Public Buildings, Together With Personal Sketches of Old Settlers of the County, and Those Contributing Views.* E.F. Heisler & Company, Publishers, Wyandotte, Kansas.
- Historic Preservation Department
- 1984 *Kansas Preservation Plan; Study Unit on the Period of Rural/Agricultural Development (1865-1900).* Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.
- 1987 *Kansas Preservation Plan; Study Unit on the Period of Settlement (1820s-1880s).* Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.
- Hudson, J.C.
- 1986 *Who Was "Forest Man?"; Sources of Migration to the Plains.* *Great Plains Quarterly* 6(2):69-83.

Hyde, G.E.

1974 *The Pawnee Indians*. Second Edition. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.

Kane, K. L.

1995 *Historic Context for the World War II Ordnance Department's Government-Owned Contractor-Operated (GOCO) Industrial Facilities, 1939-1945*. U.S. Army Materiel Command Historic Context Series, Report of Investigations No. 1, Geo-Marine, Inc., Plano, Texas. Submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District under Contract No. DACA63-93-D-0014, Delivery Order No. 014.

Katz, P.R.

1971 Archaeology of the Sutter Site in Northeastern Kansas. *Plains Anthropologist* 16(51):1-19.

1973 Radiocarbon Dates from the Sutter Site, Northeastern Kansas. *Plains Anthropologist* 18(60):167-168.

Kent, B.C.

1989 *Susquehanna's Indians*. Anthropological Series No. 6. Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, Harrisburg.

Knoebel, E.W., and R.H. Davis

1928 *Soil Survey of Johnson County, Kansas*. United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Chemistry and Soils Series No. 17. Washington, D.C.

Knudson, R.

1973 *Organizational Variability in the Later Paleo-Indian Assemblages*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.

Kopsick, P.R.

1982 Geology of the Little Blue Valley. In *Little Blue Prehistory: Archaeological Investigations at Blue Springs and Longview Lakes, Jackson County, Missouri*, edited by L.J. Schmits. Submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Kansas City District.

Leaf, G.R.

1979 *Finding, Managing, and Studying Prehistoric Cultural Resources at El Dorado Lake, Kansas (Phase I)*. University of Kansas, Museum of Anthropology Research Series No. 2. Submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Tulsa District.

Lees, W.B.

1989 *Kansas Preservation Plan; Section on Historical Archeology*. Archeology Department, Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.

Litteer, L.K.

1987 *"Bleeding Kansas"; the Border War in Douglas and Adjacent Counties*. Champion Publishing, Baldwin City, Kansas.

Logan, B.

1987a *An Archaeological Survey in the Vicinity of Bonner Springs and Edwardsville, Kansas*. University of Kansas Museum of Anthropology Project Report Series No. 63. Office of Archaeological Research, Museum of Anthropology, University of Kansas, Lawrence.

1987b *Archaeological Investigations in the Clinton Lake Project Area, Northeastern Kansas: National Register Evaluation of 27 Prehistoric Sites.* Kaw Valley Engineering & Development, Inc., Junction City, Kansas.

1990 *Archaeological Investigations in the Plains Village Frontier, Northeastern Kansas.* University of Kansas Museum of Anthropology Project Report Series No. 40. Office of Archaeological Research, Museum of Anthropology, University of Kansas, Lawrence.

Louis Berger & Associates, Inc.

1990 *Fort Drum Cultural Resource Project, Task Order 11: Stage I and II Testing of Fifteen Historic Sites Within the Cantonment Area, Fort Drum, New York.* The Cultural Resource Group, Louis Berger & Associates, Inc., East Orange. Submitted to the U.S. Army, 10th Mountain (Light Infantry) Division, Fort Drum, New York, and the National Park Service Mid-Atlantic Region, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

1991 *Fort Drum Cultural Resource Project, Task Order 27: Stage I and II Archaeological and Historical Investigations of Eleven Historic Sites Within the Range Training Areas, Jefferson County, New York.* The Cultural Resource Group, Louis Berger & Associates, Inc., East Orange. Submitted to the U.S. Army, 10th Mountain (Light Infantry) Division, Fort Drum, New York, and the National Park Service Mid-Atlantic Region, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

MacDonald, G.F.

1968 *A Paleo-Indian Site in Central Nova Scotia.* Anthropological Papers No. 16. National Museum of Canada.

MacDonald and Mack Partnership

1984 *Historic Properties Report, Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant, De Soto, Kansas.* Submitted to Building Technology, Inc., Silver Spring Maryland, and the Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record, National Park Service.

Manning, A.E.

1984 *Nineteenth Century Farmsteads on the Inner Coastal Plain of New Jersey.* In *Selected Papers on the Identification, Evaluation, and Protection of Cultural Resources*, edited by O. Chesler, pp. 42-92. Office of New Jersey Heritage, Department of Environmental Planning, Trenton.

Marcy, Captain R.B.

1859 *The Prairie Traveler; A Hand-book for Overland Expeditions, With Maps, Illustrations, and Itineraries of the Principal Routes Between the Mississippi and the Pacific; Includes Routes, First Aid, Recommended Clothing, Shelter, Provisions, Wagon Maintenance and the Selection and Care of Horses; Information Concerning the Habits of Indians.* Reprinted. Applewood Books, The Globe Pequot Press, Old Saybrook, Connecticut. Originally published by Authority of the War Department.

Martin, L.D., K.N. Whetstone, J.D. Chorn, and C.D. Prailey

1979 *Survey of Fossil Vertebrates From East-Central Kansas; Kansas River Stabilization Study.* Museum of Natural History, University of Kansas, Lawrence. Submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Kansas City District.

Mayer-Oakes, W.J.

1955 *Prehistory of the Upper Ohio Valley; An Introductory Archeological Study.* Section of Man, Carnegie Museum, Pittsburgh.

Mehring, P.J., Jr.

- 1988 Weapons of the Ancient Americans. *National Geographic* 174:500-503.

Miner, C., and W.B. Unrau

- 1990 *The End of Indian Kansas; a Study of Cultural Revolution 1854-1871*. University of Kansas Press, Lawrence.

National Park Service

- 1992 *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*. National Register Bulletin No. 38. Interagency Resources Division, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior.

Nickens and Associates

- 1985 *An Archeological Overview and Management Plan for the Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant, Johnson County, Kansas*. Prepared for The National Park Service and the U.S. Army Materiel Development for Readiness Command under the Supervision of Woodward-Clyde Consultants. Montrose, Colorado.

O'Brien, P.J.

- 1984 *Archeology in Kansas*. University of Kansas Museum of Natural History, Public Education Series No. 9. University of Kansas, Lawrence.

- 1994 The Central Lowland Plains: An Overview A.D. 500-1500. In *Plains Indians, A.D. 500-1500; The Archaeological Past of Historic Groups*, edited by K.H. Schlesier, pp. 199-223. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.

Phillips, W.

- 1856 *The Conquest of Kansas, by Missouri and Her Allies; a History of the Troubles in Kansas, from the Passage of the Organic Act Until the Close of July, 1856*. Phillips, Sampson and Company, Boston.

Reid, K.C.

- 1980 The Achievement of Sedentism in the Kansas City Region. In *Archaic Prehistory on the Prairie-Plains Border*, edited by A.E. Johnson, pp. 29-42. University of Kansas Publications in Anthropology No. 12. University of Kansas Press, Lawrence.

- 1983 The Nebo Hill Phase: Late Archaic Prehistory in the Lower Missouri Valley. In *Archaic Hunters and Gatherers in the American Midwest*, edited by J.L. Phillips and J.A. Brown. Academic Press, New York.

Reynolds, J.D.

- 1981 The Grasshopper Falls Phase; a Newly Defined Plains Woodland Cultural-Historical Integration Phase in the Central Plains. *Missouri Archeologist* 42:85-95.

- 1987 *The Archeology of Grove Reservoir Kansas, 1969*. Kansas State Historical Society Anthropological Series No. 14. Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.

Rice, E.L.

- 1975 *My Memories of Prairie Center*. Master's thesis on file, Olathe Public Library, Olathe, Kansas.

Ritchie, W.

- 1957 *Traces of Early Man in the Northeast*. New York State Museum and Science, Bulletin No. 384.

Rogers, R.A., and L.D. Martin

1982 A Clovis Point from the Kansas River. *Transactions of the Nebraska Academy of Sciences* 85(2):78-81.

1983 American Indian Artifacts from the Kansas River. *Transactions of the Nebraska Academy of Sciences* 11:13-18.

Rogin, L.

1931 *The Introduction of Farm Machinery in its Relation to the Productivity of Labor in the Agriculture of the United States During the Nineteenth Century*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Schmits, L.J.

1980 Holocene Fluvial History and Depositional Environments at the Coffey Site, Kansas. In *Archaic Prehistory on the Prairie-Plains Border*, edited by A.E. Johnson, pp. 79-106. University of Kansas Publications in Anthropology No. 12. University of Kansas, Lawrence.

Schmits, L.J., and B.C. Bailey

1986 Prehistoric Chronology and Settlement-Subsistence Patterns in the Little Blue Valley, Western Missouri. In *Prehistory of the Little Blue Valley, Western Missouri: Archaeological Investigations at Blue Springs Lake*. Submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Kansas City District.

Self, H.

1978 *Environment and Man in Kansas*. The Regents Press of Kansas, Lawrence.

Shippee, J.M.

1948 Nebo Hill, a Lithic Complex in Western Missouri. *American Antiquity* 14(2):29-32.

Steed, L.

1973 *Ghost Towns of Johnson County, Kansas*. Master's thesis on file, Olathe Public Library, Olathe, Kansas.

Stuck, I.C.

ca. 1854 *Plat Maps of Land included in the Shawnee Indian Reservation of 1854*. Master's thesis on file, Kansas State Archives, Topeka.

United States General Land Office (USGLO)

1855a Surface Plat, Township 12 South, Range 22 East.

1855b Surface Plat, Township 13 South, Range 21 East.

1856 Surface Plat, Township 13 South, Range 22 East.

1857 Surface Plat, Township 12 South, Range 21 East.

1861 Surface Plat, Township 13 South, Range 22 East.

Unrau, W.E.

1971 *The Kansa Indians: A History of the Wind People, 1673-1873*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.

Wacker, P.O.

- 1975 *Land and People, A Cultural Geography of Preindustrial New Jersey; Origins and Settlement Patterns*. Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick.

Wallace, P.A.W.

- 1981 *Indians in Pennsylvania*. Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, Harrisburg.

Whitman, E.B., and A.D. Searl

- 1856 Map of Eastern Kansas. Reprinted. In *Kansas in Maps*, edited by R.W. Baughman, 1961, pp. 48-53. Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.

Wilson, T.P.

- 1988 *The Osage*. Chelsea House Publishers, New York.

Witty, T.A., Jr.

- 1964 Appraisal of the Archaeological Resources of the Perry Reservoir, Jefferson County, Kansas. *Kansas Anthropological Association Newsletter* 12(9). Topeka.

- 1978 Along the Southern Edge: The Central Plains Tradition in Kansas. In *The Central Plains Tradition, Internal Development and External Relationships*, edited by J. Blakeslee, pp. 56-66. Report 11, Office of the State Archaeologist, University of Iowa, Iowa City.

- 1983 *Four Archeological Sites of the Perry Lake, Kansas*. Kansas State Historical Society Anthropological Series No. 11. Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.

Wormington, H.M.

- 1957 *Ancient Man in North America*. Museum of Natural History Popular Series No. 4. Denver.